NOTES ON GNEPHOSIS Cass. (COMPOSITAE: INULEAE: GNAPHALIINAE)

by

P. S. SHORT*

ABSTRACT

Short, P. S. Notes on *Gnephosis* (Compositae: Inuleae: Gnaphaliinae). *Muelleria* 6(5): 317-319 (1987). — The name *Chrysocoryne* Endl. is reduced to the synonymy of *Gnephosis* Cass. New combinations are made in *Gnephosis* and a lectotype for the name *G. tenuissima* Cass. is chosen.

INTRODUCTION

In my revision of *Angianthus* Wendl. s. lat. (Short 1983) I reinstated certain genera previously reduced to synonymy by Bentham (1867). One of these, *Chrysocoryne* Endl., described in 1843, I considered to consist of six species. Since that revision I have examined the genus *Gnephosis* Cass., described with a single species, *G. tenuissima* Cass., in 1820, and it is now clear that *Chrysocoryne pusilla* (Benth.) Endl. is synonymous with *G. tenuissima.* Since the name *Gnephosis* has priority over the name *Chrysocoryne,* five of the species currently placed in *Chrysocoryne* need to be transferred to *Gnephosis.* The new combinations are made below and a lectotype for *G. tenuissima* is chosen.

Although my revisionary studies are incomplete it seems likely that *Gnephosis s. str.* will only include *G. tenuissima* and the five species here transferred from *Chrysocoryne.*

NEW COMBINATIONS AND SYNONYMS IN GNEPHOSIS

Except for *G. tenuissima,* detailed comments on the types of all names given here are to be found in a previous publication (Short 1983).

Gnephosis Cass., Bull. Sci. Soc. Philom. Paris 43 (1820). TYPE: *G. tenuissima* Cass.

Chrysocoryne Endl., Bot. Zeitung (Berlin) 1:457 (1843); P. Short, Muelleria 5: 185 (1983). TYPE: *C. drummondii* A. Gray.

Gnephosis drummondii (A. Gray) P. Short, *comb. nov.*

Chrysocoryne drummondii A. Gray, Hook, J. Bot. Kew Gard. Misc. 3:152 (1851), basionym. LECTOTYPE: *Drummond 16* (K).

Chrysocoryne tenella F. Muell., Trans. & Proc. Vict. Inst. Advancem. Sci. 130 (1855). — *Angianthus tenellus* (F. Muell.) Benth., Fl. Austr. 3:564 (1867). — *Styloncerus tenellus* (F. Muell.) Kuntze, Rev. Generum Pl. 367 (1891). — *Siloxerus tenellus* (F. Muell.) Ostenf., Biol. Meddel. Kongel. Danske Vidensk. Selsk. 3:138 (1921). LECTOTYPE: *Wilhelmi* (K).

Gnephosis multiflora (P. Short) P. Short, *comb. nov.*

Chrysocoryne multiflora P. Short, Muelleria 5:192 (1983), basionym. HOLOTYPE: *Chinnock 4411 & Wilson* (AD).

* National Herbarium of Victoria, Birdwood Avenue, South Yarra, Victoria, Australia, 3141.

Gnephosis tenuissima Cass., Bull. Sci. Soc. Philom. Paris 43 (1820). LECTOTYPE (here chosen — see separate discussion below): *Anon. s.n.*, "Nouv hollande, Port jackson", s. dat. (P, annotated by Cassini); ISOLECTOTYPE: *Anon. s.n.* "port jackson", s. dat. (P, ex herb. Poiret, ex herb. Moquin-Tandon, ex herb. Cosson); POSSIBLE ISOLECTOTYPES OR POSSIBLE REMAINING SYNTYPES: *Anon s.n.*, "Habitat in novaehollandia", s. dat. (P); *Anon. s.n.*, no locality, s. dat. (P, annotated by Cassini); REMAINING SYNTYPE: *Anon. s.n.*, "Baie des chiens marins, Voyage du capitaine Baudin 1801, Nouv Hollande", s. dat. (P).

Crossolepis pusilla Benth. in Endl. Enum. Pl. 61 (1837). — *Chrysocoryne pusilla* (Benth.) Endl., Bot. Zeitung (Berlin) 1:458 (1843). — *Chrysocoryne huegelii* A. Gray, Hook. J. Bot. Kew Gard. Misc. 3:151 (1851), *nom. illeg.* — *Angianthus pusillus* (Benth.) Benth., Fl. Austr. 3:564 (1867). — *Styloncerus pusillus* (Benth.) Kuntze, Rev. Generum Pl. 367 (1891). — *Siloxerus pusillus* (Benth.) Ising, Trans & Proc. Roy. Soc. S. Aust. 46:604 (1922). LECTOTYPE: *Hügel* (W).

[*Podolepis divaricata* A. Cunn. ex DC., Prod. 6:151 (1838), *nom. in sched.*]

Gnephosis tridens (P. Short) P. Short, *comb. nov.*

Chrysocoryne tridens P. Short, Muelleria 5:199 (1983), basionym. HOLOTYPE: *Short 1041* (AD).

Gnephosis trifida (P. Short) P. Short, *comb. nov.*

Chrysocoryne trifida P. Short, Muelleria 5:196 (1983), basionym. HOLOTYPE: *Short 966* (AD).

Gnephosis uniflora (Turcz.) P. Short, *comb. nov.*

Chrysocoryne uniflora Turcz, Bull. Soc. Naturalistes Moscou 24(1):188 (1851), basionym. HOLOTYPE: *Drummond 116* (KW).

Chrysocoryne myosuroides A. Gray, Hook. J. Bot. Kew Gard. Misc. 3:152 (1851). — *Angianthus myosuroides* (A. Gray) Benth., Fl. Austr. 3:563 (1867). — *Styloncerus myosuroides* (A. Gray) Kuntze, Rev. Generum Pl. 367 (1891). LECTOTYPE: *Drummond 116* (K).

LECTOTYPIFICATION OF G. TENUISSIMA CASS.

In his original publication of *G. tenuissima* Cassini (1820) noted that he had examined plants from Port Jackson and Shark Bay ('Baie des Chiens-Marins'). Five sheets, considered to be syntypes or possible syntypes, have been located in the Natural History Museum in Paris (P). The labels accompanying the sheets generally provide little information about the collections (see above). One of the sheets, annotated by Cassini and said to be from Port Jackson, has been selected as the lectotype of the name *G. tenuissima*. It consists of about nine individual plants.

All syntype material examined by Cassini appears to have been collected on the Baudin expedition (1800-1804) to Australia. However, although the expedition called at both Port Jackson and Shark Bay the reference to Port Jackson as a locality of *G. tenuissima* seems erroneous. The species is widespread across much of Australia but is only found west of the Great Dividing Range. It therefore seems more likely that all material examined by Cassini came from Shark Bay, where the species is common. All syntypes or possible syntypes strongly resemble modern collections from that region (*G. tenuissima* is polymorphic), and vessels from the Baudin expedition visited Shark Bay in 1801 and 1803 (Marchant 1982).

The two collections referred to above as possible isolectotypes or possible remaining syntypes may not be types despite the fact that one is annotated by Cassini. In P there are several collections of *G. tenuissima* made by Gaudichaud,

a member of Freycinet's expedition (1817-1820) to Australia. At least some of these collections come from Shark Bay. However, none of them can be type material of *G. tenuissima* as the expedition returned to France in November 1820 (Marchant l.c.) and Cassini had already published the name in March of that year. He subsequently may have annotated specimens collected on the Freycinet expedition, hence I am not certain that the annotated specimen is part of the type material.

Because the Port Jackson locality on the lectotype sheet is probably erroneous it seems that a further Port Jackson collection in P must be an isolectotype. The mistake in locality is unlikely to have been repeated for any collections made on the Freycinet expedition.

The remaining syntype cited above is the only collection marked as coming from "Baie des chiens marins" on the Baudin expedition. Although probably coming from the same locality as the lectotype I consider it to be a separate gathering. As it is the only collection from the Baudin expedition actually labelled as coming from Shark Bay I should possibly have selected it as the lectotype. However this sheet is not annotated by Cassini and I believe it more prudent to select the lectotype from material clearly annotated by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank Dr B. J. Conn and Miss H. I. Aston for comments on the original manuscript.

REFERENCES

Bentham, G. (1867). 'Flora Australiensis' vol. 3. (Reeve: London). *Gnephosis,* pp. 569-573.

Cassini, H. (1820). Description d'un nouveau genre de plantes (*Gnephosis*). *Bull. Sci. Soc. Philom. Paris* 1820: 43-44.

Marchant, L. R. (1982). 'France Australe'. (Artlook Books: Perth).

Short, P. S. (1983). A revision of *Angianthus* Wendl., *sensu lato* (Compositae: Inuleae: Gnaphaliinae). *Muelleria* 5: 143-214.

Manuscript received 20 May 1986.